

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.: 22-cv-21574-MGC

JANIERKY PEREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

WATER PRO, LLC.,  
and MATTHEW SOCARRAZ, individually,

Defendants.

---

**JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF ORDER APPROVING  
SETTLEMENT AND DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff, JANIERKY PEREZ, (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), and Defendants, WATER PRO, LLC. and MATTHEW SOCARRAZ, individually (hereinafter, collectively as “Defendants”), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, hereby file this Joint Motion for Entry of Order Approving Settlement and jointly request that this Honorable Court approve the settlement reached in this matter and dismiss this case with prejudice, and in support thereof, state:

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW**

**I. Legal Principles**

This is an action brought by Plaintiff for alleged unpaid overtime wages and alleged retaliation under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. Section 210 *et. seq.* Defendants have denied any overtime is due to Plaintiff or that Plaintiff was retaliated against. Defendants have denied all liability with regards to Plaintiff’s claims, including the amount of any alleged unpaid wages in this action.

Pursuant to the case law regarding settlement of FLSA claims, there are two ways in which contested claims under the FLSA can be settled and released by employees. First, section 216(c) of the FLSA allows employees to settle and waive their claims under the FLSA if the payment of unpaid wages by the employer to the employee is supervised by the Secretary of Labor. See 29 U.S.C. 216(c); *Lynn's Food Stores, Inc. v. United States*, 679 F.2d 1350, 1353 (11th Cir. 1982). Second, in the context of a private lawsuit brought by an employee against an employer under section 216(b) of the FLSA, an employee may settle and release FLSA claims against an employer if the parties present the district court with a proposed settlement and the district court enters an Order approving the settlement. *Id.* In detailing the circumstances justifying court approval of an FLSA settlement in a litigation context, the Eleventh Circuit stated as follows:

Settlements may be permissible in the context of a suit brought by employees under the FLSA for back wages because initiation of the action by the employees provides some assurance of an adversarial context. The employees are likely to be represented by an attorney who can protect their rights under the statute. Thus, when the parties submit a settlement to the court for approval, the settlement is more likely to reflect a reasonable compromise of disputed issues than a mere waiver of statutory rights brought by an employer's overreaching. If a settlement in an employee FLSA suit does reflect a reasonable compromise over issues, such as FLSA coverage or computation of back wages that are actually in dispute, we allow the district court to approve the settlement in order to promote the policy of encouraging settlement of litigation.

*Lynn's Food Stores*, 679 F.2d at 1354.

The settlement of the instant action involves a situation in which the Court may approve the Parties' settlement to resolve and release Plaintiff's FLSA claims against Defendants. The proposed settlement arises out of an action brought by Plaintiff against his alleged former employer, which was adversarial in nature.

The Parties agree that the instant action involves disputed issues. Although Defendants dispute their liability for the allegedly owed overtime and for the alleged retaliation of Plaintiff, they have ultimately agreed to settle the case considering the cost of ongoing litigation.

With regards to legal fees, a court reviewing an FLSA settlement must review “the reasonableness of counsel’s legal fees to assure both that counsel is compensated adequately and that no conflict of interest taints the amount the wronged employee recovers under a settlement agreement.” *Silva v. Miller*, 2009 WL 73164, \*2 (11th Cir. Jan. 13, 2009). In the wake of *Silva*, persuasive district court authority has deemed scrutiny of the reasonableness of plaintiff’s agreed-upon attorney’s fees to be unnecessary in an FLSA settlement where “the plaintiff’s attorneys’ fee was agreed upon separately and without regard to the amount paid to the plaintiff,” except in circumstances where “the settlement does not appear reasonable on its face or there is reason to believe that the plaintiff’s recovery was adversely affected by the amount of fees paid to his attorney.” *Bonetti*, 715 F. Supp.2d at 1228<sup>1</sup>; see also *Wing v. Plann B Corp.*, 2012 WL 4746258, \*4 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 17, 2012) (declining to examine reasonableness of attorney’s fee payment in FLSA settlement where the FLSA claims were compromised, there was a reasonable basis for such compromise, and “Plaintiff’s claims were resolved separately and apart from the issue of attorneys’ fees,” such that “there is no reason to believe that Plaintiff’s recovery was adversely affected by the amount of fees and costs to be paid to Plaintiff’s counsel”).

---

<sup>1</sup> In *Bonetti*, the court explained: “if the parties submit a proposed FLSA settlement that, (1) constitutes a compromise of the plaintiff’s claims, (2) makes a full and adequate disclosure of the terms of settlement, including the factors and reasons considered in reaching same and justifying the compromise of the plaintiff’s claims, and (3) represents that the plaintiff’s attorneys’ fee was agreed upon separately and without regard to the amount paid to the plaintiff, then, unless the settlement does not appear reasonable on its face or there is reason to believe that the plaintiff’s recovery was adversely affected by the amount of fees paid to his attorney, the Court will approve the settlement without separately considering the reasonableness of the fee to be paid to plaintiff’s counsel.” *Bonetti v. Embarq Mgmt. Co.*, 715 F. Supp. 2d 1222, 1228 (M.D. Fla. 2009).

As explained in *Bonetti v. Embarq Management Company*, 715 F. Supp. 2d 1222, 1228 (M.D. Fla. 2009), “the best way to insure that no conflict [of interest between an attorney’s economic interests and those of his client] has tainted the settlement is for the parties to reach agreement as to the plaintiff’s recovery before the fees of the plaintiff’s counsel are considered. If these matters are addressed independently and seriatim, there is no reason to assume that the lawyer’s fee has influenced the reasonableness of the plaintiff’s settlement.” In *Bonetti*, Judge Presnell concluded:

[I]f the parties submit a proposed FLSA settlement that, (1) constitutes a compromise of the plaintiff’s claims; (2) makes full and adequate disclosure of the terms of settlement, including the factors and reasons considered in reaching same and justifying the compromise of the plaintiff’s claims; and (3) represents that the plaintiff’s attorneys’ fee was agreed upon separately and without regard to the amount paid to the plaintiff, then, unless the settlement does not appear reasonable on its face or there is reason to believe that the plaintiff’s recovery was adversely affected by the amount of fees paid to his attorney, the Court will approve the settlement without separately considering the reasonableness of the fee to be paid to plaintiff’s counsel.

*Id.*

## **II. Terms of Settlement**

1. This case involves claims made by Plaintiff for alleged unpaid overtime wages and alleged retaliation under the FLSA, which Defendant denies.
2. After extensive negotiations held from the commencement of this action, the parties were able to reach a settlement between them that resolved all of Plaintiff’s claims, including those for attorney’s fees and costs, which were negotiated separate and apart.
3. Plaintiff and Defendants herein state that the settlement reached between them with respect to Plaintiff’s claimed FLSA damages represents a fair and reasonable resolution of disputed claims and that the terms of the settlement are acceptable to both Plaintiff and Defendants.
4. In settlement, Plaintiff JANIERKY PEREZ will be paid a total of \$4,000.00 as full relief

and compensation of any alleged unpaid overtime wages, lost wages, liquidated damages and any other claims he may have against Defendants. From the total amount of \$4,000.00, \$2,000.00 shall be allocated in satisfaction of Plaintiff's claim for alleged "unpaid wages", and \$2,000.00 shall be allocated in satisfaction of Plaintiff's alleged claim for "liquidated damages" and in satisfaction of any other claims Plaintiff alleges he has, may have or has ever had against Defendants and the other Releasees (as defined in the parties' settlement agreement).

5. Notwithstanding, the parties dispute whether Plaintiff was in paid for all hours Plaintiff allegedly worked and whether or not Plaintiff was retaliated against.
6. Accordingly, the amount of this settlement to Plaintiff is fair and reasonable given that: Plaintiff's claims are highly disputed by Defendants and the fact that Plaintiff could be barred from recovery in this matter. Additionally, it is also reasonable given the high costs of defending and litigating this matter and the time and resources which would have been expended by both parties in taking this matter to trial. This settlement was arrived at after considerable negotiation by the parties and the Defendants do not admit any liability in this action.
7. Separate and apart, Defendants will pay Plaintiff's counsel \$3,250.00 in attorney's fees and \$500.00 in costs, which have been incurred to date in this action, including preparation and review of all settlement documents. Plaintiff's counsel, who has 16 years of experience litigating employment related matters, charges an hourly rate of \$400.00. This rate has been approved by this Honorable Court, as well as Courts in the Middle and Northern Districts of Florida. ("Plaintiff's counsel, Mr. Zandro E. Palma, Esq., charges an hourly rate of \$400.00 for litigating employment cases in both federal and state court. [27-2] at 3. The

Court does not find this hourly rate excessive. See, e.g., *Toledo v. Vioss Vision, Inc.*, No. 18-20309-CIV, 2019 WL 5689246, at \*2-3 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2019) (finding counsel's hourly rate of \$425.00 to be reasonable where the attorney had been a member of the Florida Bar for twenty years, was the founder of his law firm, and specialized in employment and labor matters)" See, *Restrepo v. Modern Roofing Experts, Inc., et al.*, Case No.: 2:21-cv-14080-KMM, [D.E. 28] (S.D. Fla. Apr. 2, 2021).

8. Plaintiff's counsel has expended over 12 hours on this matter to date, which includes time spent conducting informal discovery, employment records review, attorney-client communications, preparation and drafting of all settlement documents, and other off-the-record activity. Notwithstanding, Plaintiff's counsel's attorney's fees and costs were reduced in good faith in order to facilitate settlement. Furthermore, Plaintiff's counsel's attorney's fees and costs were negotiated separate and apart and the amount of fees and costs negotiated did not compromise in any way the amount allocated to Plaintiff. Consequentially, Plaintiff's recovery was not adversely affected by the amount of fees and costs to be paid to his attorney.
9. As set forth by the cited authority above, because attorney's fees and costs were determined separately and apart from Plaintiff's recovery, this Honorable Court should find that the settlement and attorneys' fees were agreed upon without compromising the amount paid to Plaintiff and approve the settlement without separately considering the reasonableness of the fee to be paid to plaintiff's counsel.
10. The parties' settlement agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** for the Court's consideration.
11. The attached agreement includes every term and condition of the parties' settlement.

12. Having agreed to the terms of the settlement reached, Plaintiff and Defendants respectfully request that this Honorable Court approve the settlement between the parties.
13. Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that this Court approve the Settlement attributed to Plaintiff's FLSA claims. Moreover, the parties stipulate to dismissal of this action with prejudice, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), provided that the Court enters an order retaining jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement, and otherwise deny any pending motions as moot.
14. A proposed order is provided herewith.

WHEREFORE, the Parties respectfully request that this Honorable Court approve the parties' settlement, dismisses this action with prejudice, and retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement agreement.

DATED this 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Zandro E. Palma

Zandro E. Palma, Esq.  
Florida Bar No.: 0024031  
**ZANDRO E. PALMA, P.A.**  
9100 S. Dadeland Blvd.  
Suite 1500  
Miami, Florida 33156  
Telephone No.: (305) 446-1500  
Facsimile No.: (305) 446-1502  
[zep@ThePalmaLawGroup.com](mailto:zep@ThePalmaLawGroup.com)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

/s/York M. Flik

York M. Flik, Esq.  
FBN: 101109  
**ALLEN, NORTON & BLUE, P.A.**  
121 Majorca Ave  
Suite 300  
Coral Gables, Florida 33134  
t: (305) 445-7801  
f: (305) 442-1578  
e: [yflik@anblaw.com](mailto:yflik@anblaw.com)  
*Attorney for Defendants*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.: 22-cv-21574-MGC

JANIERKY PEREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

WATER PRO, LLC.,  
and MATTHEW SOCARRAZ, individually,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO  
APPROVE THE PARTIES' SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

**THIS CAUSE** came before the Court upon the parties' Joint Motion for Entry of Order Approving Settlement and Dismissing the Case with Prejudice, and the Court having reviewed the motion and the file in this cause, having noted the agreement of the parties and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, it is hereby

**ORDERED and ADJUDGED** that the parties' settlement is hereby **APPROVED**. It is further ordered that this action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Court retains jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the parties' settlement, should such enforcement become necessary.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Chambers, in Miami-Dade County, Florida this \_\_\_\_ day of July, 2022.

---

**MARCIA G. COOKE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Copies provided to:  
All Counsel of Record